

The Honorable Jamal N. Whitehead

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

THE DUWAMISH TRIBE; and CECILE HANSEN, in her capacity as the Chairwoman of the Duwamish Tribal Council of the Duwamish Tribe,

**Plaintiffs,**

V.

DEB HAALAND, in her official capacity as U.S. Secretary of the Interior; BRYAN NEWLAND, in his official capacity as Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR; BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS; OFFICE OF FEDERAL ACKNOWLEDGEMENT; and UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

### Defendants.

Case No. 22-cv-00633-JNW

**PLAINTIFF DUWAMISH TRIBE'S  
OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS'  
MOTION TO REMAND**

**PLS.' OPP. TO DEFS.' MOT. TO REMAND**

Case No. 22-cv-00633-JNW

1

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

2	I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
3	II.	ADMINISTRATIVE HISTORY.....	2
4	III.	ARGUMENT.....	4
5	A.	The Court must review Claims I and II under the Administrative Procedure Act prior to any remand.....	6
6	B.	There is no intervening event justifying the Department's request for remand. ....	12
7	C.	The Department has no "substantial and legitimate" basis for remand. ....	14
8	1.	The record shows that the Department does not intend to genuinely reconsider the Duwamish Tribe's petition. ....	15
9	2.	The Tribe will suffer undue prejudice if this case is remanded. ....	18
10	i.	A remand would not provide the Tribe with the relief it seeks. ....	19
11	ii.	A remand could delay this proceeding by up to another decade. ....	20
12	IV.	CONCLUSION .....	22
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			

PLS.' OPP. TO DEF'S.' MOT. TO REMAND

Case No. 22-cv-00633-JNW

## **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

Page(s)

**Cases**

Agua Caliente Tribe of Cupeño Indians of Pala Reservation v. Sweeney,  
932 F.3d 1207 (9th Cir. 2019) ..... 11

Am. Waterways Operators v. Wheeler,  
427 F. Supp. 3d 95 (D.D.C. 2019) ..... 18, 21

Assiniboine & Sioux Tribes of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation v. Norton,  
527 F. Supp. 2d 130 (D.D.C. 2007) ..... 12, 17, 20, 21

Borrome v. Attorney General of U.S.,  
687 F.3d 150 (3d Cir. 2012) ..... 21

Burt Lake Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians v. Bernhardt,  
613 F. Supp. 3d 371 (D.D.C. 2020) ..... 12, 13

Cadillac of Naperville, Inc. v. NLRB,  
14 F.4th 703 (D.C. Cir. 2021) ..... 15

Cal. Cmtys. Against Toxics v. EPA,  
688 F.3d 989 (9th Cir. 2012) ..... 15

Cherokee Nation of Okla. v. Norton,  
389 F.3d 1074 (10th Cir. 2004) ..... 7

Chinook Indian Nation v. Bernhardt,  
No. 3:17-cv-05668-RBL, 2020 WL 128563 (W.D. Wash. Jan. 10, 2020) ..... 12, 13

Chinook Indian Nation v. Zinke,  
326 F. Supp. 3d 1128 (W.D. Wash. 2018) ..... 11

In re Clean Water Act Rulemaking,  
568 F. Supp. 3d 1013 (N.D. Cal. 2021) ..... 16

In re Clean Water Act Rulemaking,  
60 F.4th 583 (9th Cir. 2023) ..... *passim*

Conyers v. Merit Sys. Prot. Bd.,  
388 F.3d 1380 (Fed. Cir. 2004) ..... 7

**PLS.' OPP. TO DEF'S.' MOT. TO REMAND**

Case No. 22-cv-00633-JNW

1	<i>Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Haaland,</i> 641 F. Supp. 3d 835 (N.D. Cal. 2022) .....	18
2		
3	<i>Duwamish et al. v. United States,</i> 79 Ct. Cl. 530 (Ct. Cl. 1934).....	9
4		
5	<i>Duwamish Tribe v. United States</i> 5 Ind. Cl. Comm. 117 (Ind. Cl. Comm. 1957)).....	9
6		
7	<i>FEC v. Legi-Tech., Inc.,</i> 75 F.3d 704 (D.C. Cir. 1996).....	17
8		
9	<i>In re Fed. Acknowledgment of the Duwamish Tribal Org.,</i> No. IBIA 16-008, 2019 WL 1930741 (IBIA Apr. 17, 2019).....	4
10		
11	<i>Firebaugh Canal Co. v. United States,</i> 203 F.3d 568 (9th Cir. 2000) .....	10
12		
13	<i>Greene v. Babbitt,</i> 943 F. Supp. 1278 (W.D. Wash. 1996) .....	10
14		
15	<i>Hansen v. Salazar,</i> No. C08-0717-JCC, 2013 WL 1192607 (W.D. Wash. Mar. 22, 2013) .....	3, 13
16		
17	<i>James v. U.S. Dep’t of Health &amp; Human Servs.,</i> 824 F.2d 1132 (D.C. Cir. 1987).....	11
18		
19	<i>Keltner v. United States,</i> 148 Fed. Cl. 552 (Fed. Cl. 2020) .....	<i>passim</i>
20		
21	<i>Limnia, Inc. v. U.S. Dep’t of Energy,</i> 857 F.3d 379 (D.C. Cir. 2017).....	12, 15, 18
22		
23	<i>Lutheran Church-Mo. Synod v. FCC,</i> 141 F.3d 344 (D.C. Cir. 1998).....	14, 15
24		
25	<i>McGirt v. Oklahoma,</i> 140 S. Ct. 2452 (2020).....	7
26		
	<i>Nat. Res. Def. Council v. EPA,</i> 38 F.4th 34 (9th Cir. 2022) .....	4, 5
	<i>Pac. Coast Fed’n of Fishermen’s Assocs. v. Raimondo,</i> No. 1:20-cv-00426-DAD-EPG, 2022 WL 789122 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 11, 2022).....	18

PLS.’ OPP. TO DEFS.’ MOT. TO REMAND

Case No. 22-cv-00633-JNW

1	<i>Rahman v. United States</i> , 149 Fed. Cl. 685 (Fed. Cl. 2020) .....	12
2		
3	<i>SKF USA Inc. v. United States</i> , 254 F.3d 1022 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	<i>passim</i>
4		
5	<i>United States v. Dion</i> , 476 U.S. 734 (1986).....	7
6		
7	<i>Upper Skagit Tribe of Indians, et al. v. United States</i> , 13 Ind. Cl. Comm. 583 (Ind. Cl. Comm. 1964).....	10
8		
9	<b>Statutes</b>	
10	5 U.S.C. § 703.....	10, 11
11	5 U.S.C. § 706.....	10, 11
12	25 U.S.C. § 70 <i>et seq.</i> .....	9
13	Act of 1966, Pub. L. No. 89-660, 80 Stat. 910 (1966).....	10
14	Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994, Pub. L. No. 103-454, 108 Stat. 4791 (1994) (codified at 25 U.S.C. § 5130 <i>et seq.</i> ) .....	7, 8, 10, 19
15	Indian Claims Commission Act, 60 Stat. 1049, ch. 959 (1946) .....	9
16	Treaty of Point Elliott, 12 Stat. 927 (1859) .....	8, 9
17	<b>Other Authorities</b>	
18	25 C.F.R. § 83.12 .....	19
19	79 Fed. Reg. 30,766 (May 29, 2014) .....	3
20	80 Fed. Reg. 37,862 (July 1, 2015).....	<i>passim</i>
21	87 Fed. Reg. 24,908, 24,908 (Apr. 27, 2022) .....	14
22	U.S. CONST. art. I, § 8, cl. 3 .....	7
23		
24		
25		
26		

PLS.’ OPP. TO DEFS.’ MOT. TO REMAND

Case No. 22-cv-00633-JNW

## I. INTRODUCTION

The U.S. Department of the Interior (“Department”) seeks a voluntary remand to evade judicial review of its unlawful and unjust refusal to place the Duwamish Tribe on its list of federally recognized tribes. The Department offers no cognizable justification to support a voluntary remand, and remanding to the Department for yet further administrative process would be highly prejudicial to the Duwamish Tribe, who has been seeking federal acknowledgment before the Department for 47 years. The Duwamish Tribe asserts claims that are ripe for adjudication right now, require no further fact finding, and are dispositive: if granted, those claims would obviate the need for any further consideration of the Tribe’s petition by the Department.

In particular, the Tribe contends that the U.S. government has already recognized the Duwamish Tribe through congressional action, statutes, and judicial rulings, that the Department lacks authority to find otherwise, and so the Department’s finding to the contrary is erroneous as a matter of law. In the Tribe’s first and second claims for relief (Claims I and II), the Duwamish asks this Court to review the evidence of prior federal recognition, declare that the U.S. government has indeed already recognized the Duwamish Tribe, and order the Department to place the Duwamish Tribe on its list of federally recognized tribes. A remand is neither necessary nor appropriate to resolve those claims. Indeed, the Department does not commit to reconsider its refusal to credit those statutes and rulings as constituting prior recognition by the U.S. government. The Department has also unambiguously told this Court that reconsideration under the 2015 regulations would lead to another denial of recognition. There is no basis to defer the Court’s review of the Department’s decision on those issues, and further delay would only harm the Duwamish.

**PLS.' OPP. TO DEF'S.' MOT. TO REMAND**

Case No. 22-cv-00633-JNW

1        In addition, while the alternative relief the Tribe seeks for Claims III, IV, and V is a remand,  
2 the Department's voluntary remand would not provide all of the relief the Duwamish seeks.  
3 Critically, the Duwamish Tribe has challenged the validity of the Department's regulations  
4 concerning previously recognized tribes and seeks a remand with instructions so that the  
5 Department does not commit the same errors again. Allowing a voluntary remand without  
6 necessary sideboards would ignore instructions the Tribe contends are necessary, and would risk  
7 repeat of error.

9        Because the Department's remand motion lacks justification and would be highly  
10 prejudicial to the Duwamish, the Court should deny that motion and allow this case to proceed to  
11 summary judgment.

## 12                    II. ADMINISTRATIVE HISTORY

14        A brief history of the Duwamish Tribe's federal recognition process showcases the extent  
15 of its efforts for federal recognition and the delay on the part of the Department:

- 16        • On June 7, 1977, the Duwamish filed a letter with the Department expressing  
17            its intent to petition for federal acknowledgment as an Indian tribe. AR 36.<sup>1</sup>
- 18        • In November 1987, the Tribe submitted its formal petition for federal  
19            acknowledgment. AR 36.
- 20        • On January 19, 2001, the Acting Assistant Secretary of Indian Affairs ("ASIA")  
21            Anderson provided his Federal Register notice for the Duwamish Final  
22            Determination to the Branch of Acknowledgment and Research recommending  
23            federal recognition of the Duwamish Tribe. AR 38. Secretary Anderson found  
24            that "express statutory references" to the Tribe were "unequivocal expressions  
25            of congressional recognition." AR 7082.
- 26        • On January 20, 2001, a new administration took office and the Department of  
Interior leadership, including Secretary Anderson, vacated their positions. AR

25        <sup>1</sup> Administrative Record ("AR") excerpts cited in this brief are attached as Exhibit 1 to the Declaration of Courtney  
26            Neufeld ("Neufeld Decl.").

PLS.' OPP. TO DEFS.' MOT. TO REMAND

Case No. 22-cv-00633-JNW

1           38.

- 2
- 3         • On September 25, 2001, the new ASIA reversed the final determination that  
4           would have acknowledged the Duwamish and failed to consider the Tribe under  
5           the 1994 Regulations. AR 38–39.
  - 6         • On December 31, 2001, the Duwamish filed a request for reconsideration with  
7           the Interior Board of Indian Appeals (“IBIA”). AR 39.
  - 8         • On January 4, 2002, the IBIA referred two issues to the Secretary of the Interior:  
9           (1) “Whether the January 19, 2001, action taken by the Acting Assistant  
10           Secretary [Anderson] was a final determination to acknowledge the  
11           [Duwamish]” and (2) “if so, whether the September 25, 2001, final  
12           determination should be retracted and the January 19, 2001, final determination  
13           reinstated.” AR 39. (This is well over 14 years from the formal submission of  
14           the petition in 1987.)
  - 15         • On May 8, 2002, Secretary of the Interior Gale A. Norton declined to request  
16           that the ASIA reconsider the Department’s Final Determination declining to  
17           acknowledge the Duwamish. AR 39. This decision became effective on May 8,  
18           2002 constituting a final agency action. AR 39.
  - 19         • On May 7, 2008, the Duwamish Tribe challenged the final determination  
20           against acknowledgment in this Court in *Hansen v. Salazar*, No. C08-0717-  
21           JCC, 2013 WL 1192607 (W.D. Wash. Mar. 22, 2013) (Coughenour, J.).
  - 22         • On March 22, 2013, this Court vacated the Department’s decision denying the  
23           Duwamish federal recognition, finding it to be “arbitrary and capricious” for  
24           failure to consider the Duwamish under the then current regulations, which  
25           were adopted in 1994. *Id.* at \*9–10. The Court remanded the matter back to the  
26           Department “to either consider the Duwamish petition under the 1994  
                  acknowledgment regulations or explain why it declines to do so.” *Id.* at \*11.
  - 27         • On May 29, 2014, the Department proposed new federal acknowledgment  
28           regulations, which were adopted on July 1, 2015. 79 Fed. Reg. 30,766 (May 29,  
29           2014); *see* 80 Fed. Reg. 37,862 (July 1, 2015) (“2015 Regulations”).
  - 30         • On October 28, 2014, the Duwamish sent a letter to the Department requesting  
31           consideration under the 2015 Regulations. AR 9.
  - 32         • On December 24, 2014, the Duwamish sent a second letter to the Department  
33           requesting consideration under the 2015 Regulations. AR 15.
  - 34         • On July 24, 2015, the Department issued its Final Decision on Remand (“FDR”)  
35           refusing to consider the Duwamish under the 2015 Regulations and again

PLS.’ OPP. TO DEF’S.’ MOT. TO REMAND

Case No. 22-cv-00633-JNW

1           declining to acknowledge the Duwamish Tribe. AR 34, 48–49.

- 2
- 3         • On April 17, 2019, the IBIA issued a decision upholding the FDR and referring  
4           various issues to the Secretary of Interior (“Secretary”). *In re Fed.*  
5           *Acknowledgment of the Duwamish Tribal Org.*, No. IBIA 16-008, 2019 WL  
6           1930741, at \*36 (IBIA Apr. 17, 2019). (This is over six years from the date of  
7           Judge Coughenour’s remand order.)
  - 8         • The Final Decision on Remand became a final agency action on July 17, 2019,  
9           when the Secretary declined to consider any of the issues referred by the IBIA.  
10          AR 6022.<sup>2</sup>
  - 11         • On May 11, 2022, the Duwamish filed suit challenging both the regulations  
12           themselves and the Department’s ultimate decision. Dkt. No. 1 (Compl.).

### 13           III. ARGUMENT

14           The leading case on the standards for voluntary remands is *SKF USA Inc. v. United States*,  
15          254 F.3d 1022 (Fed. Cir. 2001). *See Keltner v. United States*, 148 Fed. Cl. 552, 561 (Fed. Cl. 2020)  
16          (“SKF USA is by far the leading authority on the law of voluntary remands. The Third, Fourth,  
17          Sixth, Seventh, Ninth, and D.C. Circuits explicitly have followed or have cited the decision with  
18          approval.”) (citing, e.g., *Cal. Cmtys. Against Toxics v. EPA*, 688 F.3d 989, 992 (9th Cir. 2012));  
19          *see also Nat. Res. Def. Council v. EPA*, 38 F.4th 34, 60 (9th Cir. 2022) (also citing SKF USA). In  
20          *SKF USA*, the court identified five positions an agency can take when faced with judicial review  
21          of its action. 254 F.3d at 1027–29. Three are relevant here.

22           First, an agency “may choose to defend [its] decision on the grounds previously articulated  
23          by the agency.” *Id.* at 1028. In such a situation, the “obligation of the court is clear,” it must “review  
24          the agency’s decision under the Administrative Procedure Act and any other applicable law.” *Id.*

25           Second, an agency “may seek a remand because of intervening events outside of the

---

26          <sup>2</sup> This process took six years from the date of Judge Coughenour’s remand order to result in a final agency action.

1 agency's control, for example, a new legal decision or the passage of new legislation." *Id.* Remand  
2 is justified "if the intervening event may affect the validity of the agency action." *Id.*; *Nat. Res.*  
3 *Def. Council*, 38 F.4th at 60 ("[I]ntervening events outside of the agency's control . . . counsel in  
4 favor of granting such a remand request . . . [but] we have 'broad discretion' in deciding whether  
5 to do so." (emphasis added) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted)).  
6

7 Third, even without an intervening event, an agency "may request a remand (without  
8 confessing error) in order to reconsider its previous position." *SKF USA*, 254 F.3d at 1029. In that  
9 situation, "the reviewing court has discretion over whether to remand," and a remand request is  
10 "usually appropriate" when the agency's concern is "substantial and legitimate," but may be  
11 refused if the request is "frivolous or in bad faith." *Id.*; see *Keltner*, 148 Fed. Cl. at 566–67 (noting  
12 "a great deal of space on the discretion continuum between whether a remand request is  
13 'substantial and legitimate' or is 'in bad faith and frivolous,'" and denying remand because of the  
14 "total absence of any meaningful justification for a remand" and "the attendant further delay that  
15 would result").  
16

17 In all situations, courts "possess 'broad discretion' in deciding whether to grant voluntary  
18 remands." *In re Clean Water Act Rulemaking*, 60 F.4th 583, 596 (9th Cir. 2023) (quoting *Util.*  
19 *Solid Waste Activities Grp. v. EPA*, 901 F.3d 414, 436 (D.C. Cir. 2018)); *Keltner*, 148 Fed. Cl. at  
20 563 ("the trial court has substantial discretion depending on the timing of the government's motion  
21 [and] its representations regarding the reasons for a remand"). The Department agrees. Dkt. No.  
22 73 at 7 ("courts retain 'broad discretion' in deciding whether to grant an agency's request for  
23 voluntary remand").  
24

25 In its motion, the Department both defends the merits of its decision to deny the Duwamish  
26

PLS.' OPP. TO DEFS.' MOT. TO REMAND

Case No. 22-cv-00633-JNW

1 recognition; and it seeks a voluntary remand to reconsider its prior decision because of alleged  
2 intervening events. The Department's purported reasons, however, do not justify remand of the  
3 Duwamish petition—which has toiled at the agency level for nearly 50 years at this point. The  
4 Department largely admits it intends to defend the merits of its decision, which obliges the Court  
5 to review the Tribe's claims. Likewise, the intervening events cited by the Department to justify  
6 remand are irrelevant to and have no bearing on this case. The Department also failed to put forth  
7 any “substantial and legitimate” reason for a remand, and its failure to provide such a justification  
8 indicates that the remand request is simply a maneuver to avoid judicial review of its decision  
9 before it can button up its already predetermined outcome.

10

11 **A. The Court must review Claims I and II under the Administrative Procedure Act**  
12 **prior to any remand.**

13       The Duwamish Tribe and the Department disagree on a fundamental issue: whether the  
14 U.S. government has previously recognized the Duwamish Tribe as the same entity as, or the  
15 successor in interest to, the entity that signed the Treaty of Point Elliott in 1855. The Department  
16 maintains that the Duwamish Tribe was created in 1925 and is a completely separate entity than  
17 the historic treaty tribe. AR 43–45. The Duwamish contends otherwise: it is the historic treaty  
18 tribe. Dkt. No. 2 (Am. Compl.).

19       The Department's remand motion is fatally flawed because it does not commit to  
20 reconsidering this fundamental question. Indeed, the Department's motion reiterates its position  
21 and contends the Tribe's claims lack merit. Dkt. No. 73 at 12–15. Where the Department seeks to  
22 “defend [its] decision on the grounds previously articulated by the agency,” the “obligation of the  
23 court is clear”: it must “review the agency's decision under the [APA] and any other applicable  
24 law.” *SKF USA*, 254 F.3d at 1028; *see Keltner*, 148 Fed. Cl. at 560 (concluding when “the agency

25  
26 PLS.' OPP. TO DEFS.' MOT. TO REMAND

Case No. 22-cv-00633-JNW

1 defends its decision on the grounds articulated by the agency” it is “by definition . . . *not* [a]  
2 voluntary remand situation[”]).

3 In bringing Claims I and II, the Duwamish Tribe asks the Court to declare that the U.S.  
4 government has already recognized the Tribe through the Treaty of Point Elliott as well as  
5 numerous statutes and judicial decisions both before and after 1925, and that the Department lacks  
6 authority to override such recognitions. It further seeks to compel the Department to add the  
7 Duwamish Tribe to its list of recognized tribes in accordance with the Federally Recognized Indian  
8 Tribe List Act of 1994 (“List Act”), Pub. L. No. 103-454, 108 Stat. 4791 (1994) (codified at 25  
9 U.S.C. § 5130 *et seq.*). Congress’s intent in passing the List Act was “clear,” as the Act expressly  
10 contemplates that Indigenous tribes may be recognized *outside* of the Department’s regulatory  
11 process, including by an “Act of Congress” or “a decision of a United States court.” *Cherokee*  
12 *Nation of Okla. v. Norton*, 389 F.3d 1074, 1076 (10th Cir. 2004) (citing Pub. L. No. 103-454, §  
13 103(3)). Most critically, the List Act provides that “a tribe which has been recognized in one of  
14 these manners may not be terminated except by an Act of Congress,” recognizing that “the  
15 Constitution, as interpreted by Federal case law, invests *Congress* with plenary authority over  
16 Indian Affairs.” Pub. L. No. 103-454, § 103(1), (4) (codified at 25 U.S.C. § 5130 notes<sup>3</sup>) (emphasis  
17 added). *See, e.g.*, U.S. CONST. art. I, § 8, cl. 3 (the Indian Commerce Clause); *United States v.*  
18 *Dion*, 476 U.S. 734, 738 (1986) (“As a general rule, Indians enjoy exclusive treaty rights . . . unless  
19 such rights were clearly relinquished by treaty or have been modified by Congress.”); *accord*  
20  
21  
22  
23

24       <sup>3</sup> The fact that Congress’s formal findings were “codified as a statutory note is of no moment.” *Conyers v. Merit Sys.*  
25 *Prot. Bd.*, 388 F.3d 1380, 1382 n.2 (Fed. Cir. 2004). “[P]rovision[s] of an Act must be read ‘in the context of the entire  
26 Act, rather than in the context of the ‘arrangement’ selected by the codifier.’” *Id.* (quoting *United States v. Welden*,  
377 U.S. 95, 98 n.4 (1964)).

PLS.’ OPP. TO DEFS.’ MOT. TO REMAND

Case No. 22-cv-00633-JNW

1       *McGirt v. Oklahoma*, 140 S. Ct. 2452, 2463 (2020) (stating that Congress must “clearly express  
2 its intent” to terminate a tribal right, “[c]ommon[ly with an] [e]xplicit reference to cession or other  
3 language evidencing the present and total surrender of all tribal interests” (internal quotation marks  
4 omitted)). The Department therefore has no power to terminate the prior federal recognition of the  
5 Duwamish Tribe (summarized below), absent a clearly expressed Act of Congress terminating the  
6 Tribe’s prior recognition. *See* Pub. L. No. 103-454, § 103(1)–(5) (codified at 25 U.S.C. § 5130  
7 notes). This authority demonstrates that the Tribe’s Claims I and II involve pure legal questions  
8 that are ripe for this Court to resolve.<sup>4</sup>

10       After the Duwamish Tribe and other allied tribes in Western Washington signed the Treaty  
11 of Point Elliott with the United States in 1855, the federal government—including Congress, U.S.  
12 courts, and the Department—repeatedly recognized the Duwamish as an Indigenous tribe that has  
13 resided in present-day Seattle since time immemorial. AR 2852, 2862. The Department contends  
14 that the Duwamish Tribe now before the Court is somehow divorced from the treaty tribe led by  
15 Chief Seattle. Dkt. No. 73 at 4. But the historical record proves otherwise. The United States  
16 repeatedly and continuously recognized the Duwamish Tribe as the treaty tribe long before and  
17 after 1925. A brief timeline of the federal government’s recognition of the Duwamish as the  
18 historic treaty tribe is summarized here:

- 20
- 21       • **1855:** The United States executed the Treaty with the Duwamish and 21 allied  
22 tribes. Chief Seattle, who signed on behalf of the Duwamish and Suquamish  
23 Tribes, was the lead signatory. *See* Treaty between the United States and the  
Dwámish, Suquámish, and other allied and subordinate Tribes of Indians in  
Washington Territory (“Treaty of Point Elliott”), 12 Stat. 927 (1859)

24       <sup>4</sup> To be clear, the Tribe is *not* asking the Court to substitute its judgment for that of the agency. This Court need not  
25 recognize the Duwamish in the first instance because the Tribe has already been federally recognized, repeatedly, over  
the last 169 years. *See infra* Section III(A). The Tribe simply seeks to vindicate its rights as a recognized tribe through  
26 declaratory and mandamus relief, which is expressly available under the APA.

PLS.’ OPP. TO DEFS.’ MOT. TO REMAND

Case No. 22-cv-00633-JNW

(concluded at Point Elliott, January 22, 1855); AR 2862.

- **1859:** Congress ratified the Treaty. *See* Treaty of Point Elliott, 12 Stat. 927; AR 2828.
- **1860–1924:** Congress passed an Act every year (about 50 total) denominating the “D’Wamish and other allied Tribes,” which appropriated funds for fulfilling treaty promises to those tribes. AR 2870–71. Once the appropriations legislation ended in the 1920s, from 1925 to the 1950s, the Department issued Duwamish members Indian identification cards (a.k.a. “blue cards”) affirming their treaty fishing and hunting rights. AR 2910, 2914, 3032–33.
- **1934:** The U.S. Court of Claims ruled that the Duwamish had standing as an Indigenous tribe and treaty signatory to bring claims against the federal government for lost communal property and unpaid annuities. *Duwamish et al. v. United States*, 79 Ct. Cl. 530, 532 (Ct. Cl. 1934).<sup>5</sup> At that time, the Executive Branch did not dispute (as it does today) that the Tribe was a “part[y] to the treaty of Point Elliott.” *Id.* at 575; *see also* Neufeld Decl., Ex. 2 at 4–5 (1935 Petition for Writ of Certiorari listing the Duwamish Tribe as a lead plaintiff and indicating it is a “part[y] to the treaty made with [the United States] at Point Elliot[t], January 22, 1855”).<sup>6</sup>
- **1953:** the House of Representatives issued a congressional report identifying the Duwamish as an Indigenous tribe multiple times. *See* AR 42212, 43008, 43010.<sup>7</sup> Those repeated identifications were based on a list of Washington tribes compiled by the Department—one that consisted of 36 total tribes, including the Duwamish. AR 2916.
- **1957–64:** The Indian Claims Commission (“ICC”), with express subject matter jurisdiction from Congress (*see* Indian Claims Commission Act, 60 Stat. 1049, ch. 959 (1946) (former 25 U.S.C. § 70 *et seq.*)), issued decisions concluding that the Duwamish is “an identifiable tribe of American Indians” and is the

<sup>5</sup> The Duwamish Tribe was the lead plaintiff in this action, along with other Western Washington tribes that asserted claims against the United States, including the Muckleshoot, Suquamish, Tulalip, Lummi, Snoqualmie, Samish, and many other tribes that are now federally recognized. *See* 79 Ct. Cl. at 532.

<sup>6</sup> There are other relatively recent examples in which the Department recognized the existence of the Duwamish Tribe. In 1974, for example, a Department task force, led by Peter P. Three Stars, a Tribal Operations Specialist at the time who later became the Superintendent of the Bureau of Indian Affairs’ Western Washington Agency, investigated the tribal status of the Duwamish, evaluating the Tribe under criteria used by the Department at that time, and recommended that the Department “officially recognize the Duwamish descendants as an Indian tribe.” AR 2920–21.

<sup>7</sup> The Duwamish Tribal Council is the *only* tribal council listed as an “Indian tribal governing bod[y]” (on Table K of that 1953 Report) that is not currently recognized by the Department. *See* AR 43010.

PLS.’ OPP. TO DEFS.’ MOT. TO REMAND

Case No. 22-cv-00633-JNW

1       “successor in interest to . . . the entity that was a party to the Treaty of January  
2       22, 1855.”). AR 24883–84 (*Duwamish Tribe v. United States* (Docket No. 109),  
3       5 Ind. Cl. Comm. 117 (Ind. Cl. Comm. 1957)); *see also* Neufeld Decl., Ex. 3  
4       (*Upper Skagit Tribe of Indians, et al. v. United States*, 13 Ind. Cl. Comm. 583  
5       (Ind. Cl. Comm. 1964)) (allocating \$23,863.17 specifically to the Duwamish in  
6       light of the 1957 determinations).

- 7       • **1966:** Congress passed an Act denominating the Duwamish, which funded the  
8       ICC judgment in favor of the Duwamish. Act of 1966, Pub. L. No. 89-660, 80  
9       Stat. 910 (1966).
- 10      • **1976–77:** A Congressional commission, the American Indian Policy Review  
11     Commission (“AIPRC”), issued two reports that concluded the Duwamish  
12     satisfied every single criteria for “determining if a group constitutes a ‘tribe,’”  
13     and that the Duwamish “continue[d] to function as [a] tribal entit[y]” despite  
14     “the enormous odds against [its] survival.” *See, e.g.*, AR 1171, 1174.

1       These authorities clearly establish that the United States has recognized the Duwamish  
2       Tribe. Once recognized, only Congress can terminate recognition. List Act, Pub. L. No. 103-454,  
3       § 103(4) (“[A] tribe which has been recognized in one of these manners may not be terminated  
4       except by an Act of Congress.”). Congress has not terminated recognition of the Duwamish Tribe.  
5       The Department has no authority to terminate the Tribe’s prior recognition. *Id.* This lawsuit asks  
6       the Court to declare and give effect to the Tribe’s status as being recognized by the United States.  
7       The Court can and should resolve these issues now.

8       Moreover, contrary to the Department’s contentions, Dkt. No. 73 at 12–13, the relief the  
9       Duwamish requests in Claims I and II is squarely within the authority of this Court to order. The  
10      Tribe’s requested declaratory and mandamus relief is expressly contemplated by the APA, 5  
11      U.S.C. §§ 703, 706(1), and courts routinely grant such relief “[w]hen the intent of Congress is  
12      clear.” *Firebaugh Canal Co. v. United States*, 203 F.3d 568, 574, 578 (9th Cir. 2000) (finding an  
13      Act of Congress mandated the agency to take action and affirming the district court’s order to  
14      compel agency action under 5 U.S.C. § 706(1)); *see Greene v. Babbitt*, 943 F. Supp. 1278, 1289  
15      (1996) (same).

16      PLS.’ OPP. TO DEFS.’ MOT. TO REMAND

17      Case No. 22-cv-00633-JNW

1 (W.D. Wash. 1996) (Zilly, J.) (granting the Samish Tribe “relief *without* remand to the agency,”  
2 which ultimately resulted in the Department’s recognition of the Samish) (emphasis added).<sup>8</sup>

3       The Department’s contention that the only relief available is serial remands to the  
4 Department, Dkt. No. 73 at 12–13, simply ignores the plain language of the APA, 5 U.S.C. §§ 703,  
5 706(1). The Department made a decision after the Tribe exhausted the Part 83 process. The  
6 Duwamish timely challenged that decision under the APA, contending among other things that the  
7 decision is “not in accordance with law.” *Id.* § 706. The Ninth Circuit recognized that the court’s  
8 broad discretion regarding voluntary remands “allows a court to deny a voluntary remand—and  
9 thus to proceed to decide the merits of the case—if the risk of harm from indefinitely leaving an  
10 allegedly unlawful rule in place outweighs considerations of judicial and administrative  
11 efficiency.” *In re Clean Water Act Rulemaking*, 60 F.4th at 596. Here, again the Department seeks  
12 to unlawfully ignore the Duwamish Tribe’s prior federal acknowledgment. The full suite of APA  
13 remedies is presently available to the Duwamish to challenge the Department’s decision. *See* 5  
14 U.S.C. § 706.  
15

16       Because the Department is not committing to reconsider its decision on the fundamental  
17 question of the Tribe’s prior federal recognition and instead defends that position in its own  
18 motion, this case does not even fall into the category of cases eligible for voluntary remand. *See*  
19 *Keltner*, 148 Fed. Cl. at 560 (cases where an agency defends its decision “by definition are *not*  
20

---

21       <sup>8</sup> To support its position that APA declaratory and mandamus relief are unavailable, it cites to cases that have little  
22 relevance here. *See* Dkt. No. 73 at 13–14. Those cases all involve petitioning tribes who failed to petition the  
23 Department at all and thus failed to exhaust the agency’s regulatory process (a.k.a., the “Part 83 process”). *See, e.g.*,  
24 *Agua Caliente Tribe of Cupeño Indians of Pala Reservation v. Sweeney*, 932 F.3d 1207, 1216–18 (9th Cir. 2019);  
25 *James v. U.S. Dep’t of Health & Human Servs.*, 824 F.2d 1132, 1137 (D.C. Cir. 1987); *Chinook Indian Nation v. Zinke*, 326 F. Supp. 3d 1128, 1137 (W.D. Wash. 2018). And in the case of the Duwamish, there is extensive  
26 documentation of prior federal recognition through modern times. Those cases are not useful precedents for this case.

PLS.’ OPP. TO DEFS.’ MOT. TO REMAND

Case No. 22-cv-00633-JNW

1 voluntary remand situations") (emphasis in original). Even if it did, remand should be denied  
2 because it would "serve no useful purpose." *Rahman v. United States*, 149 Fed. Cl. 685, 689 (Fed.  
3 Cl. 2020) (citing *Martinez v. United States*, 333 F.3d 1295, 1310 (Fed. Cir. 2003)); *see also, e.g.*,  
4 *Limnia, Inc. v. U.S. Dep't of Energy*, 857 F.3d 379, 387–88 (D.C. Cir. 2017) (reversing remand  
5 order where petitioner lacked any other "opportunity to vindicate its statutory rights under the  
6 APA" and "judicial vindication" was necessary to address the agency's "deficiencies [that  
7 petitioner] claim[ed] were pretext for the Department's unlawful political favoritism");  
8 *Assiniboine & Sioux Tribes of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation v. Norton*, 527 F. Supp. 2d 130,  
9 135 (D.D.C. 2007) ("*Assiniboine & Sioux Tribes*") (declining to remand to the Department to  
10 develop trust accounting plan for tribes where plan was unlikely to aid the court's determination  
11 on the threshold question of the Department's duty and breach).  
12

13 **B. There is no intervening event justifying the Department's request for remand.**

14 The Department has failed to identify an intervening event that would justify a remand. An  
15 intervening event justifies a remand only where that event "may affect the validity of the agency  
16 action." *SKF USA*, 254 F.3d at 1028. There is no such intervening event here.

17 The Department contends that two district court decisions issued four years ago constitute  
18 "intervening events" in this case: *Chinook Indian Nation v. Bernhardt*, No. 3:17-cv-05668-RBL,  
19 2020 WL 128563 (W.D. Wash. Jan. 10, 2020) ("*Chinook*"), and *Burt Lake Band of Ottawa and*  
20 *Chippewa Indians v. Bernhardt*, 613 F. Supp. 3d 371 (D.D.C. 2020) ("*Burt Lake*").<sup>9</sup> In *Chinook*  
21 and *Burt Lake*, the petitioning tribes challenged the Department's failure to allow tribes whose  
22

23  
24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 <sup>9</sup> The *Chinook* and *Burt Lake* decisions were issued *four years ago* and the Department has not explained why it waited nearly *two*  
26 *years* after this litigation was filed (in May 2022) to request remand, given the agency has been on notice of these two cases since  
2020.

PLS.' OPP. TO DEFS.' MOT. TO REMAND

Case No. 22-cv-00633-JNW

1 petitions the Department had previously denied to re-petition for recognition under the 2015  
2 Regulations. *Chinook*, 2020 WL 128563, at \*5; *Burt Lake*, 613 F. Supp. 3d at 376. Unlike here, in  
3 both cases the tribes' windows for appeal "ha[d] long since passed." *Burt Lake*, 613 F. Supp. 3d  
4 at 375; see *Chinook*, 2020 WL 128563, at \*1. The district courts concluded that the Department's  
5 decision to remove the re-petition process from the 2015 Regulations was "illogical, conclusory,  
6 and unsupported by the administrative record." *Chinook*, 2020 WL 128563, at \*8; see *Burt Lake*,  
7 613 F. Supp. 3d at 384–85.

8  
9 Those cases have nothing to do with this case. The Duwamish Tribe is not challenging the  
10 failure of the 2015 Regulations to allow for re-petitioning. The Tribe is seeking judicial review of  
11 the Department's decision to deny recognition to the Duwamish Tribe. Neither *Chinook* nor *Burt*  
12 *Lake* has any bearing on "the validity" of the Department's decision to deny recognition to the  
13 Duwamish Tribe. *SKF USA*, 254 F.3d at 1028. Indeed, the Department concedes that "the case at  
14 bar does not explicitly involve re-petitioning." Dkt. No. 73 at 8. The Department ignores the fact  
15 that Judge Coughenour granted summary judgment against the Department indicating the  
16 Duwamish are clearly not re-petitioning. See *Hansen*, 2013 WL 1192607, at \*11 (remanding to  
17 Department for further consideration).

18  
19 The Department contends these cases are relevant because it denied the Tribe's request for  
20 consideration under the 2015 Regulations as "tantamount to re-petitioning," which the federal  
21 acknowledgment regulations "explicitly prohibit." Dkt. No. 73 at 8–9 (citing FDR at 2–3). This  
22 contention makes little sense. Despite the rulings in *Chinook* and *Burt Lake*, the Department still  
23 has not changed its regulations to allow re-petitioning: they still "explicitly prohibit" re-  
24 petitioning. *Id.* The so-called "intervening events" have not altered the status quo.  
25  
26

PLS.' OPP. TO DEFS.' MOT. TO REMAND

Case No. 22-cv-00633-JNW

1       The Department’s cryptic reliance on an unpublished notice of proposed rulemaking  
2 “addressing the availability of re-petitioning” is unavailing. Dkt. No. 73 at 8. Even assuming this  
3 notice contemplates some form of re-petitioning (which the Department does not even claim<sup>10</sup>), it  
4 still would provide no basis for voluntary remand because it is non-binding on the agency. *See*  
5 *Lutheran Church-Mo. Synod v. FCC*, 141 F.3d 344, 349 (D.C. Cir. 1998) (denying agency’s  
6 request for voluntary remand based on a “post-argument ‘policy statement,’ which . . . does not  
7 bind the [agency] to a result in any particular case,” and which the court characterized as a “novel”  
8 and “rather unusual legal tactic[] . . . to avoid judicial review”).

9  
10      The Department also does not commit to changing the status quo in light of *Chinook* and  
11 *Burt Lake*. The Department acknowledges that it “has always taken the position that petitions for  
12 federal acknowledgment denied under the 1978 and 1994 regulations would also be denied if  
13 assessed under the 2015 regulations.” Dkt. No. 73 at 9. The Department then merely observes that  
14 two courts have “questioned that position.” *Id.* That statement says absolutely nothing about the  
15 Department’s intentions, or whether there has been any change to the position the Department has  
16 “always taken” that the results are the same under the 1978, 1994, or 2015 regulations. *Id.*  
17

18      *Chinook* and *Burt Lake* are not “intervening events,” do not affect the validity of the  
19 Department’s decision in this case, and thus cannot support a voluntary remand.  
20

21 **C.     The Department has no “substantial and legitimate” basis for remand.**

22      The Department’s alternative justification for voluntary remand also fails. An agency may  
23 request a voluntary remand to reconsider its decision, provided that the agency’s motivating  
24

25      <sup>10</sup> Less than two years ago, but following *Chinook* and *Burt Lake*, the Department formally proposed “to maintain the  
26 [re-petition] ban.” 87 Fed. Reg. 24,908, 24,908 (Apr. 27, 2022).

PLS.’ OPP. TO DEFS.’ MOT. TO REMAND

Case No. 22-cv-00633-JNW

1 concern is “substantial and legitimate” and not “frivolous or in bad faith.” *SKF USA*, 254 F.3d at  
2 1029; *Cal. Cmtys. Against Toxics*, 688 F.3d at 992. A remand request is “substantial and  
3 legitimate” where it is “compelling,” such as where the agency “inten[ds] to reconsider, re-review,  
4 or modify the original agency decision” and the agency “explain[s] how or why the [agency] would  
5 reconsider its decision.” *Keltner*, 148 Fed. Cl. at 562, 564–65 (emphasis in original); *Cadillac of  
6 Naperville, Inc. v. NLRB*, 14 F.4th 703, 719 (D.C. Cir. 2021) (granting NLRB request for remand  
7 where an intervening NLRB decision changed how the agency would have assessed the issue in  
8 the first instance). A reconsideration is not genuine if the record shows that the agency has “all but  
9 prejudged” the merits of its decision. *Keltner*, 148 Fed. Cl. at 567.

11 Moreover, while genuine reconsideration is necessary, it is “not always a sufficient  
12 condition.” *Id.* at 562 (quoting *Am. Waterways Operators v. Wheeler*, 427 F. Supp. 3d 95, 98–99  
13 (D.D.C. 2019)). The “[C]ourt must also ‘consider whether remand would unduly prejudice the  
14 non-moving party.’” *Id.* For example, the Court should consider whether the agency’s request “was  
15 a ‘ploy’ merely ‘to avoid judicial review,’” or if “remand would not ‘further the interests of  
16 justice,’ but would delay this case further.” *Id.* at 560, 565.

18       **1. The record shows that the Department does not intend to genuinely  
19 reconsider the Duwamish Tribe’s petition.**

20       The Department has not expressed a genuine intent to actually reconsider its decision  
21 denying the Duwamish recognition. When an agency does not actually intend to reconsider the  
22 challenged decision, “that is reason enough to deny a voluntary remand.” *In re Clean Water Act  
23 Rulemaking*, 60 F.4th at 596; *see, e.g., Limnia*, 857 F.3d at 387 (reversing remand order where  
24 agency stopped short of offering to reconsider the petitioner’s application and instead “offered to  
25 review any new applications”); *Lutheran Church-Mo. Synod*, 141 F.3d at 349 (denying the  
26 PLS.’ OPP. TO DEFS.’ MOT. TO REMAND

Case No. 22-cv-00633-JNW

1 government’s “novel, last second motion to remand” on appeal because it did “not bind the  
2 [agency] to a result” and noting that “the [agency] ha[d] on occasion employed some rather unusual  
3 legal tactics when it wished to avoid judicial review, but th[at] ploy [took] the prize”).<sup>11</sup>

4       The Department denied the Tribe’s petition for failing three of seven criteria necessary for  
5 recognition under the Department’s regulations. *See* AR 33 (“This [FDR] concludes that the DTO  
6 petitioner does not meet criteria 83.7(a), 83.7(b), and 83.7(c) under either the 1978 or the 1994  
7 regulations.”). The Department does not commit to reconsidering these three criteria, or commit  
8 to changing its position that the Duwamish petition would also be denied under the 2015  
9 regulations. *See* Dkt. No. 73 at 10–11 (stating only that the Department has “concerns” that  
10 *Chinook* and *Burt Lake* suggest that the outcome of this case could be different under the 2015  
11 regulations). The Department says it will give the Tribe an “opportunity to make arguments” about  
12 the use of marriages as evidence of community. Dkt. No. 73 at 9; *see also id.* at 11. But any such  
13 arguments would be directed at only one criteria necessary for recognition. The Department does  
14 not commit to reconsidering its position that the Tribe fails to meet the other two criteria, nor its  
15 position that the Tribe is “not a continuation of the D’Wamish and other allied tribes” and not  
16 previously recognized by the federal government. AR 34. Thus, a remand to “make arguments”  
17 about one criterion would be pointless if failure of the other two criteria is pre-determined.  
18

19       The Department’s failure to commit to genuine reconsideration is bolstered by the record.  
20 Until the assertions of the Department’s counsel in its remand motion (which is unsupported by  
21  
22  
23

24       <sup>11</sup> The Department relies on *In re Clean Water Act Rulemaking*, 568 F. Supp. 3d 1013 (N.D. Cal. 2021) to support its  
25 argument that “courts generally grant motions for a voluntary remand.” Dkt. No. 73 at 9. However, the district court’s  
26 remand order was reversed by the Ninth Circuit “in its entirety” for “reconsideration of the EPA’s remand motion.”  
*In re Clean Water Act Rulemaking*, 60 F.4th at 596.

PLS.’ OPP. TO DEF’S.’ MOT. TO REMAND

Case No. 22-cv-00633-JNW

any declarations of the Department itself<sup>12</sup>), the Department has consistently represented to this court that the Duwamish would be denied federal recognition under the 2015 Regulations. AR 34; Dkt. No. 46 at 8, 10 (Defs.’ Supp. Br.). In the FDR, for example, the Department found that the Duwamish is “not a continuation of the D’Wamish and other allied tribes” and “did not provide sufficient evidence of community or political influence and authority at any time, even after it formed in 1925.” AR 34. The Department went on to conclude that the Tribe “would still face these fundamental problems” under the 2015 Regulations. *Id.*

Throughout this litigation, the Department has reaffirmed that “both of these findings [in the FDR] would result in a negative finding under not only the 1978 and 1994 regulations *but also the 2015 regulations.*” Dkt. No. 46 at 8 (emphasis added); *see also id.* at 10. Because the Department has declined to reconsider the Duwamish petition under its current regulations and has expressly predetermined the outcome if it were to apply them, this “is reason enough to deny [its] voluntary remand [request].” *In re Clean Water Act Rulemaking*, 60 F.4th at 596; *see also, e.g., FEC v. Legi-Tech., Inc.*, 75 F.3d 704, 708–09 (D.C. Cir. 1996) (“[R]emand to the agency is an unnecessary formality where the outcome is clear.” (citing *Am. Fed’n of Gov’t Emps. v. Fed. Lab. Rels. Auth.*, 778 F.2d 850, 862 n.19 (D.C. Cir. 1985)); *A.L. Pharma, Inc. v. Shalala*, 62 F.3d 1484, 1489 (D.C. Cir. 1995) (noting that remand is futile and unnecessary “where ‘[t]here is not the slightest uncertainty as to the outcome of a[n] [agency] proceeding’” (citation omitted)).

In filing this Motion, the Department does not confess any error in failing to apply the 2015

<sup>12</sup> See *Assiniboine & Sioux Tribes*, 527 F. Supp. at 135–36 (denying agency’s request for remand because agency’s justification did not constitute “substantial and legitimate” grounds where agency submitted a declaration in support of remand motion identifying “several factors the agency will consider in developing its accounting plan” but where the agency’s “obligation to create tribal accounting plans ha[d] been evident for years”).

PLS.’ OPP. TO DEF’S.’ MOT. TO REMAND

Case No. 22-cv-00633-JNW

1      Regulations (or ignoring key evidence in the record). *See* Dkt. No. 73 at 7, 9; *see also Pac. Coast*  
2      *Fed'n of Fishermen's Assocs. v. Raimondo*, No. 1:20-cv-00426-DAD-EPG, 2022 WL 789122, at  
3      \*11 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 11, 2022) ("[C]ourts have refused to grant remand where the agency's position  
4      does not demonstrate a commitment to a changed approach."). The agency also does not give any  
5      clear indication of how it will proceed on remand. *See Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Haaland*,  
6      641 F. Supp. 3d 835, 841–42 (N.D. Cal. 2022) (remanding after "presidential administration  
7      signaled that it would reevaluate the [challenged] 2019 ESA Rules and rescind many of them").  
8  
9      The Department provides only blanket speculation that it "*might* lead the Department to make a  
10     different determination on acknowledgment" and that "*is willing* to commit to a changed  
11     approach." Dkt. No. 73 at 10–11 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted) (emphasis added).  
12  
13     If the Department's repeated actions over the past decade are any indication, the agency's request  
14     to reconsider the Duwamish petition is likely nothing more than an attempt to "write a better  
15     decision for [its] predetermined outcome." *Keltner*, 148 Fed. Cl. at 565; *Limnia*, 857 F.3d at 388  
16     (reversing district court's "voluntary remand order [that] was a 'remand' in name only"). The  
17     Court should not afford the Department a *third* bite at the apple. *See Am. Waterways Operators*,  
18     427 F. Supp. 3d at 98, 100 (denying agency a "second bite at the apple" where agency sought to  
19     revisit an "otherwise final decision based solely on its new-found desire" to purportedly  
20     "reconsider" certain factors that had already been considered years prior to litigation). Instead, this  
21     Court should deny remand where it is clear the Department's outcome is predetermined.  
22

23      **2. The Tribe will suffer undue prejudice if this case is remanded.**

24      The Tribe will be unduly prejudiced if this case is remanded to the Department before the  
25      Tribe's claims are heard on the merits. Not only will the Tribe be unable to challenge the validity  
26

PLS.' OPP. TO DEF'S.' MOT. TO REMAND

Case No. 22-cv-00633-JNW

1 of the 2015 Regulations (as applied to the Duwamish) on remand, a remand at this late stage will  
2 only delay resolution of the Tribe’s petition by several years—meaning the Tribe’s petition could  
3 be pending more than *50 years* before it gets a final decision restoring the Tribe’s status as a  
4 federally recognized tribe.

5       *i. A remand would not provide the Tribe with the relief it seeks.*

6           The Department maintains that even if the Tribe prevails on its claims, “the only relief to  
7 which [it is] entitled under the APA is remand to the agency for further consideration.” Dkt. No.  
8 73 at 11. This is incorrect.

9           As Section III(A) explains, in bringing Claims I and II, the Tribe seeks a judicial  
10 declaration that it is a previously recognized tribe and an order compelling the Department to place  
11 the Tribe on the agency’s list of federally recognized tribe. *See* Dkt. No. 2 at ¶¶ 95, 105, 142–43  
12 (Am. Compl.). That is, if the Tribe prevails on Claims I and II, the Tribe would not be required to  
13 wait up to another decade for the Department to reconsider the Tribe’s petition under the 2015  
14 Regulations in order to restore its rights as a previously recognized tribe.

15           Critically, even if the Department were to apply the 2015 Regulations on remand, the  
16 agency cannot resolve the Tribe’s challenges to the 2015 Regulations themselves as unlawful  
17 under the List Act, 25 U.S.C. § 5130 *et seq.* The List Act expressly provides that *Congress*, not  
18 the Department, enjoys plenary power over Indian Affairs, including the exclusive power to  
19 terminate a tribe’s status as a previously recognized tribe. *See* Pub. L. No. 103-454, § 103(1), (3)–  
20 (5) (codified at 25 U.S.C. § 5130 notes). But the Department’s 2015 Regulations allow the  
21 *Department* to terminate a tribe’s status as an Indigenous tribe, even one that was *previously*  
22 *recognized by Congress*, like the Duwamish. *See* 25 C.F.R. § 83.12. The 2015 Regulations  
23  
24  
25  
26

PLS.’ OPP. TO DEFS.’ MOT. TO REMAND

Case No. 22-cv-00633-JNW

1 therefore permit the agency to usurp Congress's *sole* power to terminate the prior federal  
2 recognition of a tribe. *Id.*

3 Because the Tribe asks this court to review the legality of the 2015 Regulations themselves,  
4 it would be improper for the agency to reconsider the Tribe's petition under regulations that the  
5 Tribe maintains are unlawful. Thus, the Department's claim that a remand avoids current review  
6 by this court is simply incorrect.  
7

8 *ii. A remand could delay this proceeding by up to another decade.*

9 Further, delaying this action another decade—so that the Department may again review the  
10 Tribe's petition under the 2015 Regulations—will unduly prejudice the Tribe and its members and  
11 delay their day in Court. The Duwamish Tribe has sought federal acknowledgment from the  
12 Department since 1977. AR 36. The Department has taken 14 years and over 6 years the two prior  
13 times it has considered the Duwamish petition. *See supra* Section II.  
14

15 In *Keltner*, the court found prejudice “in the total absence of any meaningful justification  
16 for a remand . . . and the attendant further delay that would result”; there, the court concluded the  
17 government’s “remand request [was] quite difficult to fathom” and denied the request. 148 Fed.  
18 Cl. at 566–67. Likewise, in *Assiniboine & Sioux Tribes*, the court found prejudice where the  
19 “department ha[d] been on notice of [the petitioner’s] concerns for decades,” and it had known  
20 about the “intervening events” before that suit was filed; in that case, the court concluded that any  
21 further delay “would be inappropriate” and, again, denied the request. 527 F. Supp. 2d at 136.  
22

23 Here, just as in *Keltner* and *Assiniboine & Sioux Tribes*, the Department has failed to  
24 provide a meaningful justification for remand; the Department has been on notice that the  
25 Duwamish Tribe was entitled to review under the 2015 Regulations for nearly a decade; the  
26

PLS.' OPP. TO DEFS.' MOT. TO REMAND

Case No. 22-cv-00633-JNW

K&L GATES LLP  
925 FOURTH AVENUE  
SUITE 2900  
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98104-1158  
TELEPHONE: +1 206 623 7580  
FACSIMILE: +1 206 623 7022

1 Department has been on notice of the two cases it now deems as “intervening events” (*Chinook*  
2 and *Burt Lake*) for nearly four years (both of which were decided two years before this case was  
3 even filed); and any further delay of the Tribe’s petition—up to a decade of additional agency  
4 review—would mean that the Tribe’s petition could be pending more than *50 years* before it gets  
5 a final decision restoring the Tribe’s status as a federally recognized tribe. This excessive delay of  
6 justice would be highly inappropriate and “difficult to fathom.” *Keltner*, 148 Fed. Cl. at 566–67;  
7 *see Assiniboine & Sioux Tribes*, 527 F. Supp. 2d at 136.

8  
9 Relatedly, the Department cannot now claim in good faith that remand will promote  
10 “judicial economy” where the Department has already forecasted the “negative” result under the  
11 2015 Regulations. Dkt. No. 46 at 8, 10; *Borrome v. Attorney General of U.S.*, 687 F.3d 150, 156  
12 n.4 (3d Cir. 2012) (“The [agency] had the opportunity to consider the issues . . . [but] chose not to  
13 do so.”). If the Department denies the Duwamish petition for a third time, as it has already  
14 represented it would do, the remand will inevitably result in “piecemeal litigation . . . for years to  
15 come.” *Am. Waterways Operators*, 507 F. Supp. 3d at 58. The Department’s inexplicable delays  
16 and the timing of this request weigh in favor of denying the Department’s request for remand.  
17

18 These delays have real consequences for the Tribe. For every year of delay, Duwamish  
19 tribal members struggle without the critical federal resources necessary to support their health and  
20 wellbeing. The Duwamish Tribal Council has passed a resolution opposing remand and urging  
21 judicial review of their claim for recognition. Hansen Decl., Ex. A; *see* Hansen Decl., ¶ 9;  
22 Rasmussen Decl., ¶ 14. Duwamish members are denied a voice in state-mandated tribal education,  
23 Nelson Decl., ¶ 12, and “government-to-government relationships with the federal government,  
24 state and local governments, and other federally recognized tribes.” Hansen Decl., ¶ 9.  
25

26 PLS.’ OPP. TO DEFS.’ MOT. TO REMAND

Case No. 22-cv-00633-JNW

1       The lack of federal recognition also results in a lack of control over the Tribe's historical  
2 sites and cultural artifacts. *Id* at ¶¶ 10–12. Cecile Hansen, Chairwoman of the Duwamish Tribal  
3 Council, has protested various Port of Seattle development projects taking place on historic  
4 Duwamish village sites, including near həʔapus Village Park where “historic artifacts were found  
5 by the Duwamish Tribe and US Army Corps of Engineers representatives” in 1977. Neufeld Decl.,  
6 Ex. 4; Hansen Decl., ¶ 11. The Tribe sought to build its longhouse on the site, but “the Port refused  
7 [its] request to build [its] longhouse at this site.” Hansen Decl., ¶ 10. In another painful incident,  
8 “cultural artifacts of the Duwamish Tribe related to waterfront village sites” held in the Duwamish  
9 Longhouse and Cultural Center were removed and transferred to federally recognized tribes in  
10 2013. *Id.* at ¶ 12. This was devastating for the Tribe and its members that relied on these artifacts  
11 as both a connection to their ancestors and a tool for educating the community about the Duwamish  
12 people. *See id.*

15       The longer that the Tribe goes unrecognized by the Department, “the memory of the  
16 Duwamish Tribe” will continue to be “*erased from society.*” Workman Decl., ¶ 14 (emphasis  
17 added). James Rasmussen, a Duwamish Tribal Councilmember, summarizes the pain felt by the  
18 Duwamish people:

19       My mother is dead. And federal recognition was very important to her. I truly  
20 wanted to see the Tribe recognized before she passed away, but she is gone. And  
21 within the Tribe, we have many people who are dead or close to death that have  
22 worked hard for this. **But how many generations have to pass before we realize  
what was promised to us?**

23 Rasmussen Decl., ¶ 15 (emphasis added).

#### 24                  IV. CONCLUSION

25       The Duwamish Tribe respectfully asks the Court to deny the Department’s remand motion

26 PLS.’ OPP. TO DEFS.’ MOT. TO REMAND

Case No. 22-cv-00633-JNW

K&L GATES LLP

925 FOURTH AVENUE

SUITE 2900

SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98104-1158

TELEPHONE: +1 206 623 7580

FACSIMILE: +1 206 623 7022

1 because it fails to set forth a substantial and legitimate basis for remand and is highly prejudicial  
2 to the Duwamish Tribe. At a minimum, the Court should resolve the merits of the Tribe's Claims  
3 I and II for declaratory and mandamus relief. If the Tribe prevails on those claims, the remaining  
4 claims are moot and no remand is necessary. Claims III–V can be addressed, if necessary, after  
5 this Court has provided specific instruction to the Department regarding the Tribe's equal  
6 protection claim as well as how the 2015 Regulations address the prior recognition of the  
7 Duwamish Tribe.

9 DATED this 22nd day of January, 2024.  
10  
11

12 Respectfully Submitted,  
13

14 K&L GATES LLP  
15  
16 By: s/ Bart J. Freedman  
17 Bart J. Freedman, WSBA # 14187  
18 Theodore J. Angelis, WSBA # 30300  
19 J. Timothy Hobbs, WSBA # 42665  
20 Benjamin A. Mayer, WSBA # 45700  
21 Endre M. Szalay, WSBA # 53898  
22 Shelby R. Stoner, WSBA # 52837  
23 Natalie J. Reid, WSBA # 55745  
24 Courtney A. Neufeld, WSBA # 60154  
25 Isabella C. Forcino, WSBA # 61346  
26  
27 925 Fourth Avenue, Suite 2900  
28 Seattle, Washington 98104-1158  
29 Tel: +1 206 623 7580  
30 Fax: +1 206 623 7022  
31 Emails: bart.freedman@klgates.com  
32 theo.angelis@klgates.com  
33 tim.hobbs@klgates.com  
34 ben.mayer@klgates.com  
35  
36 PLS.' OPP. TO DEF'S.' MOT. TO REMAND  
37 Case No. 22-cv-00633-JNW  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000  
1001  
1002  
1003  
1004  
1005  
1006  
1007  
1008  
1009  
1000  
1001  
1002  
1003  
1004  
1005  
1006  
1007  
1008  
1009  
1010  
1011  
1012  
1013  
1014  
1015  
1016  
1017  
1018  
1019  
1010  
1011  
1012  
1013  
1014  
1015  
1016  
1017  
1018  
1019  
1020  
1021  
1022  
1023  
1024  
1025  
1026  
1027  
1028  
1029  
1020  
1021  
1022  
1023  
1024  
1025  
1026  
1027  
1028  
1029  
1030  
1031  
1032  
1033  
1034  
1035  
1036  
1037  
1038  
1039  
1030  
1031  
1032  
1033  
1034  
1035  
1036  
1037  
1038  
1039  
1040  
1041  
1042  
1043  
1044  
1045  
1046  
1047  
1048  
1049  
1040  
1041  
1042  
1043  
1044  
1045  
1046  
1047  
1048  
1049  
1050  
1051  
1052  
1053  
1054  
1055  
1056  
1057  
1058  
1059  
1050  
1051  
1052  
1053  
1054  
1055  
1056  
1057  
1058  
1059  
1060  
1061  
1062  
1063  
1064  
1065  
1066  
1067  
1068  
1069  
1060  
1061  
1062  
1063  
1064  
1065  
1066  
1067  
1068  
1069  
1070  
1071  
1072  
1073  
1074  
1075  
1076  
1077  
1078  
1079  
1070  
1071  
1072  
1073  
1074  
1075  
1076  
1077  
1078  
1079  
1080  
1081  
1082  
1083  
1084  
1085  
1086  
1087  
1088  
1089  
1080  
1081  
1082  
1083  
1084  
1085  
1086  
1087  
1088  
1089  
1090  
1091  
1092  
1093  
1094  
1095  
1096  
1097  
1098  
1099  
1090  
1091  
1092  
1093  
1094  
1095  
1096  
1097  
1098  
1099  
1100  
1101  
1102  
1103  
1104  
1105  
1106  
1107  
1108  
1109  
1100  
1101  
1102  
1103  
1104  
1105  
1106  
1107  
1108  
1109  
1110  
1111  
1112  
1113  
1114  
1115  
1116  
1117  
1118  
1119  
1110  
1111  
1112  
1113  
1114  
1115  
1116  
1117  
1118  
1119  
1120  
1121  
1122  
1123  
1124  
1125  
1126  
1127  
1128  
1129  
1120  
1121  
1122  
1123  
1124  
1125  
1126  
1127  
1128  
1129  
1130  
1131  
1132  
1133  
1134  
1135  
1136  
1137  
1138  
1139  
1130  
1131  
1132  
1133  
1134  
1135  
1136  
1137  
1138  
1139  
1140  
1141  
1142  
1143  
1144  
1145  
1146  
1147  
1148  
1149  
1140  
1141  
1142  
1143  
1144  
1145  
1146  
1147  
1148  
1149  
1150  
1151  
1152  
1153  
1154  
1155  
1156  
1157  
1158  
1159  
1150  
1151  
1152  
1153  
1154  
1155  
1156  
1157  
1158  
1159  
1160  
1161  
1162  
1163  
1164  
1165  
1166  
1167  
1168  
1169  
1160  
1161  
1162  
1163  
1164  
1165  
1166  
1167  
1168  
1169  
1170  
1171  
1172  
1173  
1174  
1175  
1176  
1177  
1178  
1179  
1170  
1171  
1172  
1173  
1174  
1175  
1176  
1177  
1178  
1179  
1180  
1181  
1182  
1183  
1184  
1185  
1186  
1187  
1188  
1189  
1180  
1181  
1182  
1183  
1184  
1185  
1186  
1187  
1188  
1189  
1190  
1191  
1192  
1193  
1194  
1195  
1196  
1197  
1198  
1199  
1190  
1191  
1192  
1193  
1194  
1195  
1196  
1197  
1198  
1199  
1200  
1201  
1202  
1203  
1204  
1205  
1206  
1207  
1208  
1209  
1200  
1201  
1202  
1203  
1204  
1205  
1206  
1207  
1208  
1209  
1210  
1211  
1212  
1213  
1214  
1215  
1216  
1217  
1218  
1219  
1210  
1211  
1212  
1213  
1214  
1215  
1216  
1217  
1218  
1219  
1220  
1221  
1222  
1223  
1224  
1225  
1226  
1227  
1228  
1229  
1220  
1221  
1222  
1223  
1224  
1225  
1226  
1227  
1228  
1229  
1230  
1231  
1232  
1233  
1234  
1235  
1236  
1237  
1238  
1239  
1230  
1231  
1232  
1233  
1234  
1235  
1236  
1237  
1238  
1239  
1240  
1241  
1242  
1243  
1244  
1245  
1246  
1247  
1248  
1249  
1240  
1241  
1242  
1243  
1244  
1245  
1246  
1247  
1248  
1249  
1250  
1251  
1252  
1253  
1254  
1255  
1256  
1257  
1258  
1259  
1250  
1251  
1252  
1253  
1254  
1255  
1256  
1257  
1258  
1259  
1260  
1261  
1262  
1263  
1264  
1265  
1266  
1267  
1268  
1269  
1260  
1261  
1262  
1263  
1264  
1265  
1266  
1267  
1268  
1269  
1270  
1271  
1272  
1273  
1274  
1275  
1276  
1277  
1278  
1279  
1270  
1271  
1272  
1273  
1274  
1275  
1276  
1277  
1278  
1279  
1280  
1281  
1282  
1283  
1284  
1285  
1286  
1287  
1288  
1289  
1280  
1281  
1282  
1283  
1284  
1285  
1286  
1287  
1288  
1289  
1290  
1291  
1292  
1293  
1294  
1295  
1296  
1297  
1298  
1299  
1290  
1291  
1292  
1293  
1294  
1295  
1296  
1297  
1298  
1299  
1300  
1301  
1302  
1303  
1304  
1305  
1306  
1307  
1308  
1309  
1300  
1301  
1302  
1303  
1304  
1305  
1306  
1307  
1308  
1309  
1310  
1311  
1312  
1313  
1314  
1315  
1316  
1317  
1318  
1319  
1310  
1311  
1312  
1313  
1314  
1315  
1316  
1317  
1318  
1319  
1320  
1321  
132

1 endre.szalay@klgates.com  
2 shelby.stoner@klgates.com  
3 natalie.reid@klgates.com  
4 courtney.neufeld@klgates.com  
5 isabella.forcino@klgates.com

6 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
*I certify that this memorandum contains 7,608 words in compliance with the Local Civil Rules.*

PLS.' OPP. TO DEF'S.' MOT. TO REMAND

Case No. 22-cv-00633-JNW